

1 -- 21. The method of claim 20 wherein the electronic program
2 guide displays programming consisting of programs produced from
3 both the first program filter and the second program filter. --

1 -- 22. The interactive filter selective mechanism of claim 20
2 wherein the second filter has at least one parameter, and at least
3 one of a user, a third party, and a service provider selects the at
4 least one parameter to provide the second filter. --

1 -- 23. The interactive filter selective mechanism of claim 20
2 wherein the second filter has at least one parameter, wherein a
3 user chooses the at least one parameter of the filter to configure
4 the filter from program/event entries in the programming database.
5 -

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 have been amended for clarity. Claims 5-23 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-23 are currently pending.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rowe. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Rowe discloses selecting a subcategory or "first set" of programming information, and selecting a category or "second set" of programming information. In particular, the Examiner asserts that for example, "user selects one or more of the subcategories of programming such as 'basketball' in category 'sports'" and that the "user selects programs by first choosing the general category for the desired programs then subcategory displaying associated with the selected category."

Claim 1 and new claims 9, 17 and 20 each recite, in part, that "at least some of the programs of the first subset are different

from the programs of the second subset, wherein at least some of the programs of the second subset are different from the programs of the first subset."

Rowe does not disclose, teach or suggest that some of the programs of the subcategory (what the Examiner refers to as the first set) are different from the programs of the category (what the Examiner refers to as the second set). In fact, Rowe teaches against having some discrete programs in each of the first and second subsets. In the Example cited above by the Examiner, and in Rowe, col. 7, lines 17-33, it is clear that the subcategory display displays a *more narrow scope* of programming information in comparison to the category display.

Because Rowe does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 9, 17, or 20, Rowe cannot anticipate nor render obvious claims 1, 9, 17, or 20 of the present invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 9, 17, and 20 are patentable. Because claims 2-8, and 10-16, 18, 19, 21-23 depend from either claims 1, 9, 17, or 20, and contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the art of record, these claims are also considered to be patentable over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, consideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Lucinda G. Auciello

Reg. No. 42,270

626/795-9900